



**Conference of the States Parties  
to the United Nations  
Convention against Corruption**

Distr.: General  
21 March 2014

Original: English

---

**Implementation Review Group**

**Fifth session**

Vienna, 2-6 June 2014

Item 2 of the provisional agenda\*

**Review of implementation of the United Nations  
Convention against Corruption**

**Regional implementation of chapter III (Criminalization  
and law enforcement) and chapter IV (International  
cooperation) of the United Nations Convention against  
Corruption**

**Report prepared by the Secretariat**

*Summary*

The present report contains supplemental information organized by region to the thematic report on the implementation of chapter III (Criminalization and law enforcement) and chapter IV (International cooperation) of the United Nations Convention against Corruption.

---

\* CAC/COSP/IRG/2014/1.



## **I. Introduction, scope and structure of the report**

1. In its resolution 3/1, the Conference adopted the terms of reference of the Review Mechanism (contained in the annex to that resolution), as well as the draft guidelines for governmental experts and the secretariat in the conduct of country reviews and the draft blueprint for country review reports (contained in the appendix to the annex to resolution 3/1), which were finalized by the Implementation Review Group at its first session, held in Vienna from 28 June to 2 July 2010.

2. In accordance with paragraphs 35 and 44 of the terms of reference of the Review Mechanism, thematic implementation reports have been prepared in order to compile the most common and relevant information on successes, good practices, challenges, observations and technical assistance needs contained in the country review reports, organized by theme, for submission to the Implementation Review Group, to serve as the basis for its analytical work.

3. The present report contains supplemental information organized by region to the thematic reports on the implementation of chapter III (Criminalization and law enforcement) and chapter IV (International cooperation) of the Convention, contained in documents CAC/COSP/IRG/2014/6, CAC/COSP/IRG/2014/7 and CAC/COSP/IRG/2014/8. This regional report is based on information included in the review reports of 56 States parties under review in the first and second years of the first cycle of the Review Mechanism whose review reports had been completed, or were close to completion, at the time of drafting.<sup>1</sup>

## **II. Implementation of selected provisions of chapter III (Criminalization and law enforcement) and chapter IV (International cooperation) of the Convention by regional group**

4. Two topics were initially selected from the thematic implementation reports for further analysis on a regional basis: specialized authorities (article 36 of the Convention) and law enforcement cooperation (article 48 of the Convention). The topics are ones where regional nuances, good practices and challenges in implementation were prevalent and where sufficient data were available from the country review reports to analyse regional trends. Further topics will be included in the regional reports as more reviews are concluded and additional data become available.

### **A. Implementation of article 36 of the Convention (specialized authorities)**

5. Among the 56 States parties covered in this regional report, all but one had established one or more bodies or specialized departments to combat corruption through law enforcement. However, often these were newly created and faced

---

<sup>1</sup> The present data are based on country reviews as at 14 February 2014.

common challenges related to limited capacity and resources for implementation as well as competing priorities. Issues regarding the independence of the specialized bodies and coordination with other relevant ministries, agencies and departments were noted across all regions. While in most countries specialized functions had been entrusted either to a stand-alone agency or to dedicated units within the prosecution services or law enforcement agencies, the reviews revealed that typically one agency had been tasked with primary responsibility for combating corruption through law enforcement. Comprehensive data on the mandate, functions, budget and staffing of the specialized bodies were not always available, and the analysis is based on the information presented in the country review reports.

### **African States**

6. In the twelve countries in the group of African States that were covered in the thematic implementation reports, the majority had established some form of commission or agency charged with the overall responsibility for combating corruption, with varying degrees of autonomy and independence. Commonalities in the approach and methods adopted depended most often on the legal systems of the countries examined, and two major groupings can be identified: countries affiliated with the common law tradition, on the one hand, and those leaning towards the civil law legal framework, on the other hand. For example, all of the eight countries affiliated with the common law tradition (all but one of which are also members of the Commonwealth of Nations) had established anti-corruption agencies, which were accountable or reported variously to Parliament, the Ministry of Justice, the government or the President. One of these States had created a relatively unique institution that combined the responsibilities of a traditional ombudsman with those of an independent anti-corruption agency. Another State had established a task force of multiple agencies charged with combating corruption through law enforcement, which comprised a central investigation unit established by Presidential decree, a special investigative police unit and the national prosecution authority. Among the civil law countries in the region, all but one had established specialized bodies in the form of anti-corruption agencies or specialized police units, which were generally accountable or reported to the Government including the police. Issues regarding the independence of the specialized bodies and their coordination with other relevant government entities, most notably the prosecution services and the police, were raised in about half of the countries in the region.

7. Only two of the specialized bodies had established a presence outside the capital city of the country, and inadequate capacity as well as a lack of resources of the agencies were reported in 75 per cent of the countries. Data on the staffing levels, technical expertise and budget of the bodies were available in about half of the countries in the region. The anti-corruption agencies in the region all followed a three-pronged approach of corruption investigation, prevention and education, with the exception of those countries that had constituted specialized police or investigative units or a task force to combat corruption through law enforcement rather than anti-corruption agencies.

8. Regarding powers of prosecution in the region, the reviews revealed that among the civil law countries, none of the specialized bodies had the mandate to prosecute cases, while in half of the common law countries full or partial prosecution powers had been delegated to the agencies. A specialization on

corruption within the prosecution services had not generally been established in the region, except where anti-corruption agencies had been vested with prosecution powers. None of the countries had established specialized anti-corruption courts, although steps were under way in one State to create a specialization in the judiciary under the Commonwealth framework. Financial intelligence units had been established and complemented the work of the specialized bodies in all but two of the countries in the region, both of which had taken steps toward the creation of such agencies through the enactment of relevant legislation.

### **Asia-Pacific States**

9. Among the group of fifteen Asia-Pacific States, ten had established specialized commissions or agencies charged with combating corruption, which were accountable to Parliament or the Head of State and had varying degrees of autonomy and independence. Anti-corruption agencies were in place in all of the common law countries except one, where an anti-corruption directorate in the police crimes division had been created and steps to constitute an independent anti-corruption commission were under way. Most of the civil law countries had created anti-corruption agencies, although in one State corruption cases were handled by a special prosecution unit in the Ministry of Justice, in another by an audit bureau under the National Assembly, and in two others by ministries with investigative authority, that were accountable either to Parliament or to Parliament and the Prime Minister. Multiple reporting lines were found to increase the independence of the agencies. For example, in one State party the anti-corruption agency reported to the President, Parliament and the State Auditor. In another State, the anti-corruption body was subject to various oversight mechanisms, including an operations review panel to review delayed cases or cases transferred for prosecution that had not resulted in a charge. The panel could submit recommendations, but had no authoritative powers that could interfere with the prosecutorial discretion of the agency. Issues regarding the independence of the specialized bodies and their coordination with other relevant government entities, most notably the prosecution services and the police, were raised in about half of the countries in the region.

10. Regarding powers of prosecution, the reviews revealed that about half of the countries in the region had granted full or partial prosecution powers to the anti-corruption agencies, with no significant difference between common law and civil law countries. Specialized units in the prosecution services or the police had not generally been established, since these functions were typically exercised by the anti-corruption agencies.

11. Inadequate capacity and technical assistance in support of the functions and operation of the specialized bodies were reported in more than half of the countries in the region. Data on the staffing levels, technical expertise and budget of the bodies was available in about half of the countries in the region. The majority of anti-corruption agencies in the region followed a three-pronged approach of corruption investigation, prevention and education. In one State it was noted that the work of the specialized body was complemented by a separate agency tasked with corruption prevention and whistle-blower protection, among other duties. In three countries in the group the agencies had also established a presence outside the capital city of the country.

12. Specialized anti-corruption courts were in operation in three countries in the region and were observed to contribute significantly to reducing case backlogs and turnaround times. For example, one State had established fourteen specialized anti-corruption courts since 2011, and judges were instructed to hear cases within one year and could be held accountable for non-compliance. All except one of the countries in the region had established financial intelligence units. It was also noted that the specialized agencies in two countries served as technical assistance providers for their counterparts from other countries on the regional or international level.

### **Eastern European States**

13. Among the twelve countries belonging to the group of Eastern European States only one had created a stand-alone anti-corruption agency, which was accountable to the President and Parliament and did not have prosecution powers. Six States had established dedicated anti-corruption departments or divisions within the Prosecutor General or State Attorney's office that exercised specialized law enforcement functions, often in coordination with corruption and economic or organized crime units in the police. The specialized prosecution units were either attached to the Executive branch or accountable to the Head of State and the judiciary. In two States that had not established dedicated anti-corruption units in the prosecution service, the Prosecutor General's Office was tasked with handling anti-corruption matters. In three further States the responsibility for combating corruption was assigned to specialized departments within the criminal police or the Ministry of Interior, and all of these countries had also created specialized anti-corruption expertise in the prosecution services. The reviewers raised issues on the independence of the specialized bodies or departments in two countries.

14. Data on the staff and level of training of the specialized bodies was available in about half of the completed reviews, while information on the available resources was provided in four reviews. Although concerns about the capacity of the specialized bodies were raised in only one country in the region, inter-agency coordination issues were observed in five countries. The mandate and activities of specialized bodies in five countries in the region encompassed preventive as well as law enforcement functions, and a regional presence was noted in four cases.

15. Three States in the region had established specialized courts or court divisions to hear corruption and serious crime cases. Financial intelligence units that complemented the investigation and prosecution of corruption and money-laundering cases had been established in all countries in the region.

### **Latin American and Caribbean States**

16. As in the group of Eastern European States, a specialization on anti-corruption had been established in all but one of the countries in the region, typically in the prosecution service. One country in the group of eight Latin American and Caribbean States had created a stand-alone anti-corruption agency, which was attached to the Ministry of Justice and did not have prosecution powers. Five States had established dedicated anti-corruption departments, divisions or expertise within the Prosecutor General's office. These were attached or accountable to Parliament or the Ministry of Justice and exercised specialized law enforcement functions, although in one case the specialized unit was not operational and relevant functions

were exercised by the Prosecutor General's Office. In only one country there was no specialization on anti-corruption cases, and the responsibility for corruption and other matters was with the General Prosecutor's office, which was subordinate to the Cabinet and Parliament. In another country in the region where the specialized mandate for corruption lay with the anti-corruption unit in the police, a specialized corruption prevention and organized crime unit had also been established in the prosecution service, and legislation had been introduced in Parliament to establish an independent body charged with the investigation and prosecution of corruption offences. Issues on the independence of the specialized bodies or departments were raised in three countries.

17. Data on the staffing levels, budget and training of the bodies or departments was not available in most cases, although inadequate capacity was not raised as a concern in any of the reviews in the region. With the exception of the country that had established a stand-alone anti-corruption commission, the mandates of the specialized services were focused on law enforcement and did not encompass preventive functions. In two countries a regional presence of the specialized body was noted.

18. Dedicated anti-corruption courts were in operation at the national or local level in three States. All except one of the countries in the region had furthermore established financial intelligence units whose functions supported the work of the specialized anti-corruption bodies.

#### **Western European and other States**

19. The situation in the nine States parties belonging to the group of Western European and other States was diverse. Specialized police services with an anti-corruption mandate (or dedicated law enforcement agencies, departments or units, sometimes encompassing corruption and serious or organized crime) had been created in all except one State. In addition, all except two countries had established a specialization in the prosecution services tasked with the primary responsibility for handling corruption and other serious crime matters. Issues on the independence of the specialized bodies were noted in two cases.

20. Data on the resources, staff and training of the specialized bodies was available for most countries in the region, although inter-agency coordination and a need for continued dedication of resources were observed in two cases. While specialized criminal courts existed in several countries, their jurisdiction was generally not limited to corruption matters. All countries in the region had established financial intelligence units, and several also served as providers of technical assistance to other countries.

21. In about half of the countries the specialized bodies had a presence outside the capital city and also exercised preventive functions. For example, one jurisdiction had established a central agency specialized in the detection of corruption that also provided intelligence, audit and expert services to administrative and judicial authorities. Using funds allocated to foreign development objectives, specialized agencies and units of one State pursued cases of overseas corruption, such as illicit flows and bribery, and helped support developing countries in investigating and prosecuting corruption, especially particularly complex and serious offences, including offences under the Convention. The dedicated resources and attention to

complex crimes and overseas corruption, in particular, were observed as an effective approach to combating corruption through law enforcement.

## **B. Implementation of article 48 of the Convention (law enforcement cooperation)**

22. When comparing the implementation of article 48 on law enforcement cooperation by the States under review, trends were mostly the same across regions and only a few characteristic differences have been identified. In all groups, only a minority of States had enacted specific legislation on international law enforcement cooperation. States relied primarily on institutional agreements, treaties or informal ad-hoc arrangements. The experience in law enforcement cooperation for corruption offences was limited in all regions. However, experience in law enforcement cooperation in general was available, and depending on the region, between 30 to 50 per cent of the countries, included information on practical cases or statistics.

23. Law enforcement cooperation through INTERPOL, as well as informal bilateral police-to-police cooperation were the most prevalent mechanisms for cooperation. Additionally, countries of the Asia-Pacific group relied mostly on institutional agreements of law enforcement authorities with their foreign counterparts, while in the Western European and other States group all countries used international treaties on law enforcement cooperation. In all but the Asia-Pacific group there were regional and subregional treaties on the matter. The Southern African subregion and the group of Latin American and Caribbean States were the regions with the highest number of regional and subregional cooperation networks. In the group of Eastern European States and the group of Western European and other States, membership in such networks did not necessarily match the composition of the groups as defined in the current report, but rather depended on the membership in regional organizations.

24. Differences could also be found in the question of law enforcement personnel exchange. While in Eastern Europe and the Western European and other States group, two thirds of the countries had placed liaison officers in other countries or organizations, this was only practised in half of the countries of the group of African and the group of Asia-Pacific States, and in none of the countries of the Latin American and Caribbean group.

25. Not all country reports contained information on cooperation between financial intelligence units (FIUs) through the Egmont Group, customs authorities through the World Customs Organization, or by means of bilateral informal cooperation. Extensive information on these aspects in some country reports did not match comparable detail in others. However, this lack of information did not necessarily mean that no relevant cooperation existed. The available data therefore did not lend itself to a reliable comparative analysis. The same was the case on the use of the Convention as a legal basis for law enforcement cooperation. In all groups, between a quarter and a half of the States parties could use the Convention as a legal basis, and only very few States explicitly excluded this possibility. However, many country reports did not contain explicit information on this question, leaving the possibility open that more States could use the Convention as a legal basis than explicitly stated.

### **African States**

26. From the twelve States of the African group, three had enacted domestic legislation (one of them only for cooperation in money-laundering cases). Also in three countries, the police had memorandums of understanding with other police agencies (in one case, there were over 30). The FIUs had bilateral memorandums in two countries. Five States had concluded bilateral treaties on law enforcement cooperation, and three countries could use the Convention as a legal basis for law enforcement cooperation, although it was noted that there had been no practice in this regard. Some regional instruments contained relevant provisions, among them the African Union Convention against Corruption, the ECOWAS Protocol on Combating Corruption, the Great Lakes Protocol and an ad-hoc agreement on criminal police cooperation between four West African States. One third of the States presented information on concrete cases.

27. The African region did not have a regional mechanism for operational law enforcement cooperation, but there were several mechanisms and instruments in the Southern African and Eastern African subregions: the Asset Recovery Inter-Agency Network of Southern Africa (ARINSA), the Southern Africa Development Community Police (SADCPOL), the Southern African Regional Police Chiefs Cooperation Organization (SARPCCO), the Southern African Police Service Cooperation (SOUTHCO), the Regional Counter-Crime Intelligence Sharing (ROCIS) Database (used in Southern Africa), as well as the Eastern Africa Police Chiefs Cooperation Organization (EAPCCO). No comparable network existed in West Africa. Not all country reports contained information on the membership status of the FIU in the Egmont Group; the FIU of one country was a member to the Group and another one had applied for membership.

28. Apart from operational law enforcement cooperation, country reports highlighted the importance of general regional and international cooperation forums for the exchange of information, which could foster useful contacts for later operational work. Some countries reported on joint training seminars or regional mechanisms for the exchange of experience and practice such as the African Association of Anti-Corruption Authorities (AACA), the Eastern African Association of Anti-Corruption Authorities (EAAACA), the Inter-Governmental Action Group against Money Laundering in West Africa (GIABA) and the Eastern and Southern Africa Anti-Money-Laundering Group (ESAAMLG), two regional FATF-style bodies, as well as the Southern African Forum against Corruption (SAFAC). One country mentioned the Indian Ocean Commission (IOC) and the International Police Chiefs Association (IPCA).

29. Beyond the region, most of the law enforcement cooperation of African States was done through the channels of INTERPOL. The prosecution services of one country had a standing cooperation arrangement with the prosecution service of a country outside the region as well as with two international organizations. Informal agreements seemed to be preferred in many countries. One country mentioned joint bilateral cooperation commissions with neighbouring countries at all levels of cooperation such as security and tax issues, and also for law enforcement cooperation. On the other hand, another country required requests for law enforcement cooperation to be submitted by diplomatic channels, a requirement that was not considered in compliance with the Convention.

30. About half of the countries of the region had exchanged law enforcement personnel. Generally, police liaison officers or liaison officers at Embassies were posted both within and beyond the region. In one country, the exchange was organized through the Southern African Development Community (SADC). Another country had relevant regulations in its law but had not yet posted officers abroad.

#### **Asia-Pacific States**

31. From the 15 States of the Asia-Pacific group, six States had adopted legislation on international law enforcement cooperation. In the majority of countries, relevant provisions were found in the laws on international cooperation or mutual legal assistance. In all but one State, law enforcement agencies had concluded memorandums of understanding with their foreign counterparts. These included agreements between anti-corruption agencies (up to 20 agreements), police agencies (up to 18), FIUs (up to 36) and prosecutor's offices (up to 20). Only three countries had concluded bilateral or regional treaties on law enforcement cooperation or used relevant provisions in their mutual legal assistance treaties. One country had a number of treaties that had not yet entered into force, and one country mentioned two Declarations by the South Pacific Forum on Law Enforcement Cooperation (Honiara Declaration 1992, Biketawa Declaration 2000). Six countries could use the Convention as a legal basis for law enforcement cooperation, and one country explicitly did not consider the Convention as a legal basis. In the rest of the reports, no information on this point was given. Seven countries presented case examples or statistics.

32. There were only few regional cooperation mechanisms with operational mandates, including ASEANAPOL (with a secure database), the Pacific Transnational Crime Coordination Center, and the Drug Offence Monitoring Desk and Trafficking Offence Monitoring Desk by the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC). One country was active in the establishment of an Asset Recovery Inter-agency Network for Asia and the Pacific (ARIN-AP). Beyond the mentioned mechanisms, law enforcement cooperation was carried out through INTERPOL. The FIUs of a number of countries in the region were part of the Egmont Group, and two were in the process of joining the Group.

33. Among the bodies to enhance the sharing of experiences were the ADB/OECD Anticorruption Initiative, the Asia-Pacific Group on Money-Laundering, the International Association of Anti-Corruption Authorities (IAACA), the Offshore Group of Banking Supervisors, the South East Asia Parties against Corruption (SEAPAC) and the South Pacific Leaders Forum.

34. Approximately half of the States of the region had placed or received liaison officers or engaged in other forms of personnel exchange. Police officers, officers of anti-corruption agencies, judges or prosecutors were placed in counterpart institutions of other countries. One country had 60 police liaison officers in 32 foreign institutions.

#### **Eastern European States**

35. Out of 12 States, three had adopted national legislation on international law enforcement cooperation. In half of the States, law enforcement institutions had concluded memorandums of understanding with their counterparts, among them

police agencies, prosecutor's offices and ministries of interior. In one State, law enforcement bodies had over 90 inter-institutional agreements and protocols, and in another State, the Ministry of Interior had memorandums of understanding with counterparts in 40 States. Ten States had concluded bilateral and multilateral agreements on international law enforcement cooperation. The regional treaties included the Council of Europe Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters, the Additional Protocol and Second Additional Protocol thereto, the Council of Europe Convention on Laundering, Search, Seizure and Confiscation of the Proceeds from Crime, the Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters between the Member States of the European Union and the Protocol thereto, two treaties of the Commonwealth of Independent States (Agreement on Cooperation of Member States of the Commonwealth of Independent States on Fight against Crime of 1998, Agreement on Cooperation of the Ministries of Interior on Fight against Organized Crime of 1994), the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC) Agreement on Cooperation on the Fight against Crime Especially in its Organized Forms and instruments concluded between the countries of the GUAM (Georgia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Republic of Moldova). Three States could use the Convention as a legal basis, in the absence of a bilateral agreement, while a number of States did not provide information on this point. Four countries provided case examples, and one country provided statistics.

36. Some countries of the region participated in the Camden Asset Recovery Inter-Agency Network (CARIN), the South-East European Law Enforcement Center (SELEC) or the Schengen Information System (SIS). The Member States of the European Union cooperated through the European Commission's Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF), Europol, Eurojust and the European Judicial Network (EJN). Beyond this, operational law enforcement cooperation was done through INTERPOL. Only in the minority of States the reports contained specific information on intelligence-sharing through FIUs, including through the Egmont Group, or the customs authorities.

37. Opportunities for experience-sharing and anti-corruption projects in the region included the European Partners Against Corruption (EPAC) and the European Anti-Corruption Network (EACN), the Group of States against Corruption (GRECO), the project "Implementation of anti-corruption plans in South-Eastern Europe" (PACO IMPACT) (both under the Council of Europe), as well as the Regional Anticorruption Initiative (RAI) of the Regional Cooperation Council (RCC).

38. Two thirds of the States had engaged in exchanges of personnel with other countries, and one country additionally with a regional centre and with INTERPOL.

#### **Latin American and Caribbean States**

39. From the eight States of the sample, only two had enacted legislation on international law enforcement cooperation. In five States, law enforcement institutions had concluded memorandums of understanding with their foreign counterparts. Those included agreements of a wide range of authorities: police agencies (2 countries), prosecutor's offices (four countries, one of them having 17 agreements), FIUs (2 countries, one of them with 39 agreements), the central bank, the Superintendence of Banks (one country with five agreements) and the Superintendence of Security and Insurance (one country with 23 agreements). Four States had ratified bilateral or regional treaties, although two of them used

their mutual legal assistance treaties. The treaties of another two States referred to specific areas, i.e. customs cooperation or intelligence-sharing. The regional agreements included the Inter-American Convention on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters and the Protocol on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters between the States Parties to MERCOSUR, Bolivia (Plurinational State of) and Chile. Four States could use the Convention as a legal basis, while two States explicitly excluded this possibility: however, one of them could act on the basis of reciprocity and did not require a treaty basis. Four countries presented statistics or case examples, one of them specifically relating to corruption offences.

40. There were several operational law enforcement and information exchange mechanisms in the region, among them, the Asset Recovery Network of the Financial Action Task Force of South America against Money-Laundering (RRAG), CARICOM with its Intelligence Committee, Joint Regional Communications Center (JRCC) and Regional Intelligence Fusion Center (RIFC), the Hemispheric Information Exchange Network for Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters and Extradition of the Organization of American States, supported by the secure information exchange platform GROOVE, the Ibero-American Network for International Legal Cooperation (IberRed), the Network of Prosecutors against Organized Crime (REFCO), the Regional Intelligence Liaison Office (RILO) and Customs Enforcement Network (CEB) (both under the World Customs Organization), as well as ad-hoc cooperation arrangements such as COMIFROM (Colombia, Costa Rica and Panama). Further, INTERPOL channels were used, as well as police cooperation through informal channels and cooperation between FIUs through EGMONT.

41. Forums for the exchange of information included, among others, the ACCP (Association of Caribbean Commissioners of Police), the Association of Supervisors of Banks of the Americas (ASBA), the OECD Working Group on Bribery, the International Organisation of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI) as well as the Financial Action Task Force of South America (GAFISUD) and the Caribbean Financial Action Task Force (GAFIC), two regional FATF-style bodies.

42. No State of the region had placed liaison officers in other countries to date, although three States did not have any impediment to doing so. Only one State had received a liaison officer from another State.

#### **Western European and other States**

43. Two of the nine States of the region had adopted national legislation. In five States, police forces had concluded memorandums of understanding with their foreign counterparts. All States of the sample had bilateral or regional treaties in place. One country had a preference for using bilateral treaties, while others preferred the multilateral frameworks. Regional instruments included the OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials, the Council of Europe Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters and the two Protocols thereto, the Council of Europe Convention on Laundering, Search, Seizure and Confiscation of the Proceeds from Crime, the Convention on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters between the Member States of the European Union, the Convention on mutual assistance and cooperation between customs administrations (Naples II Convention), the Convention on the stepping up of cross-border cooperation, particularly in combating terrorism, cross-border crime

and illegal migration (Prum Convention), and the Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement of 14 June 1985. The majority of States could use the Convention as the legal basis for law enforcement cooperation. One State could not use the Convention as a legal basis, but could cooperate without a treaty, on the basis of domestic law. Half of the countries in the region provided case examples and statistics.

44. The European Union Member States cooperated through the European Commission's Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF), Europol, Eurojust and the European Judicial Network (EJN). In one State cooperation with all States beyond the European Union took place on an ad hoc basis. Additional regional and bilateral mechanisms for law enforcement cooperation were ASEANAPOL, the Baltic Sea Task Force on Organised Crime, the Camden Asset Recovery Inter-Agency Network (CARIN), the Ibero-American Network for International Legal Cooperation (IberRed), the Portuguese Speaking Countries Judicial Network, cooperation agreements between the Nordic police authorities, the Schengen Information System (SIS) and the Pacific Transnational Crime Network (PTCN). In one State, an agency engaged in a pilot project with another country from a different geographical region that enabled it to access that country's international cooperation networks. As in the other regions, law enforcement information and financial intelligence exchange was to a great extent carried out through INTERPOL and the Egmont Group. Some countries further participated in the Asia/Pacific Group on Money-Laundering, the Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police (PICP) and the Australia and New Zealand Police Commissioners Forum.

45. Six countries had placed liaison officers abroad. Most of them were police attachés, some of them were placed in Europol and INTERPOL. One country had seven different law enforcement and security services sending liaison officers (one of them had 69 liaison officers). Two countries had posted liaison officers in more than 40 countries.